

Applicant: Thorsten Krawinkel
Application No. 10/076,822
Amendment in Response to Office Action dated February 10, 2004

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the amendments above and the following comments.

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 4 and 11 are deemed free of the prior art. New claim 14 has been added to include the subject matter of claims 1 and 11. Amendments have been made to claim 1 to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102/103. Claim 4 has been canceled, and the subject matter contained therein has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 11 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Changes that have been made to the claims are presented above using strikethrough and underlining. It is believed that no new matter has been added.

At the outset, Applicant wishes to address the showing required under 37 CFR §1.116(a) regarding why the amendments above are necessary and were not presented earlier. The amendments above were necessary to overcome the prior art rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102/103. Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102/103, claims 4 and 11 are currently free of the prior art. Therefore, by amending claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4, and adding new claim 14 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 1 and 11, Applicant believes these amendments should remove the prior art rejection. The amendments were not presented earlier because the amendments are responsive to a new ground of rejection made for the first time in the final rejection and since this is the first substantive response to the final rejection, obviously the amendments above could not have been presented earlier.

Applicant: Thorsten Krawinkel
Application No. 10/076,822
Amendment in Response to Office Action dated February 10, 2004

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102/103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by EP 816459A (equivalent to U.S. Patent No. 6,284,378), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 816459A. The Examiner found EP 816459A to teach adhesive sheet strips for bonding to a substrate which are redetachable without residue or destruction by extensive stretching in the bond plane. In response, Applicant submits claim 4, which is currently free of the prior art, has been incorporated into claim 1. In addition, new claim 14 has been added to include the subject matter of claim 1 and claim 11, which is free of the prior art. Thus, Applicant submits claim 1, the claims dependent therefrom, and new claim 14 are neither anticipated nor obvious by EP 816459A.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the Examiner would be fully justified to reconsider and to withdraw this rejection. An early notice that this rejection has been reconsidered and withdrawn is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the foregoing constitutes a bona fide response to all outstanding objections and rejections.

Applicant also believes that this application is in condition for immediate allowance. However, should any issue(s) of a minor nature remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at telephone number (212) 808-0700 so that the issue(s) might be promptly resolved.

Applicant: Thorsten Krawinkel
Application No. 10/076,822
Amendment in Response to Office Action dated February 10, 2004

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MC LAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By 
David D. Kim
Reg. No. 53,123

220 East 42nd Street
30th Floor
New York, New York 10017